EXHIBIT 2

```
1
                       UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
2
3
     IN RE DEPAKOTE:
     STACY BARTOLINI, individually )
4
     and as parent and next friend )
5
     of H.B., a minor,
                     Plaintiff(s),
6
7
                                       Case No. 3:17-cv-1146-SMY
     ٧.
     ABBOTT LABORATORIES, INC.,
                                     ) Lead Case 3:12-cv-52-NJR
8
                     Defendant.
9
10
11
                TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE
12
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE STACI M. YANDLE
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
                           November 15, 2017
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
                          Christine Dohack LaBuwi, RMR, CRR
     REPORTED BY:
                          Official Court Reporter
21
                          301 West Main Street
                          Benton, Illinois 62812
22
                          (618) 439-7725
                          Christine_Dohack@ilsd.uscourts.gov
23
24
     Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, produced
     by computer-aided transcription.
25
```

5. What is the rate of disease after exposure?

THE REPORTER: Excuse me.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm prone to do that. Thank you.

And 6. How many children have been affected?

And so you -- that gives you a little bit of, of what he thinks are important guidelines. And he goes through in that supplemental report then how he comes to his conclusions and all.

THE COURT: This is, this is, this is still the question for me, Mr. Williams. The only relevance to that particular opinion that Depakote is one of the Top Three — the only relevance to that particular opinion is, again, to give some context and background to the jury so that they could understand the dangerousness or the devastating effects associated with that drug, which he's going to testify to.

The problem is, is that in your briefings you indicate that the basis for that opinion that he intends to give is, is actually the rate at which Depakote causes birth defects and the severity. In other words, he's saying it's one of the Top Three based on the rate of which it causes birth defects and the severity of the birth defects that it causes.

I have no problems with his testimony being that

it's -- that it's dangerous and the devastating effects and him communicate -- I think he can communicate that to the jury, again, by evidence which you are calling the basis. In other words, to give testimony and to explain to the jury the rate of, at which Depakote causes birth defects, and to give them information or testify as to the severity of some of those effects.

The problem comes in, is when he gives an opinion that says it's one of the Top Three most dangerous drugs from this standpoint, without any scientific basis for it, when it's just simply based on his experience -- and I'm saying he's qualified, he's got the experience -- but it's a subjective opinion. So it's a qualitative -- it appears to be a qualitative opinion, but it's actually on a quantitative basis.

Because you're, you're saying it's one of the Top
Three dangerous drugs based on a comparison. That then
puts the -- that opens the door then for the defendants to
put on evidence as to the, the similarities or, or what's
not similar about these other three drugs that he's
referencing. And then we get into a trial within a trial
based on what's the most dangerous drugs.

To me, that -- my problem is, I believe the effects of that evidence would be much more prejudicial than it is probative, because the only probative value is,

again, as background for how devastating the effects of the drug is. Which, because of his experience and his expertise, he's in a position to give the jury a lot of different -- I mean, information -- he can communicate that to them in so many different ways that it's not -- that doesn't run into this issue.

I, I actually think -- and that's my problem with it. I know Judge Rosenstengel in the past has ruled that it's a qualitative and not a quantitative opinion. I happen to disagree. I think anytime that you, you rank something and you give a ranking to it, you gotta have some type of medical or scientific evidence to, to back that up. It can't be just based on your subjective opinions, based on your expertise and your experience. So I think it's kind of -- that's what makes it misleading.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, if I may, Your Honor, and again, I would direct you to Tab 4-B, his August 31, 2017, report. And it goes through his process for determining that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: And as -- I don't know if the Court's had a chance to read that. But if you -- when you do, you'll see that there are really accepted amongst teratologists that there's at least 20 -- about -- around -- approximately 20 human teratogens. I'm not talking

situation.

all the anti-epileptic drugs we commonly refer to as AEDs, apparently all of them have some teratogenic effect. Okay? And Abbott tries to say, based on prior experience, that all of these drugs are the same and that they all cause problems.

And what we want to show is, not only is it the worst AED -- and we'll show evidence from them where it's four times worse than the other AEDs -- not only is that true but it's many, many times worse, and it gets up in the category of the three worst drugs on the market.

If the Court -- and I hope the Court will allow us to show that, you know, how the other manufacturers -- looking at the conduct of other manufacturers in this situation, in Thalidomide and Accutane, manufacturers have what's called an "I pledge" program and a Steps program. So -- and I had a daughter who took Accutane. And what the manufacturers do in this situation, Your Honor, it's like, if you want to go on Accutane for acne, you have to get a blood test to make sure you are not pregnant; you have to come back a couple weeks later, get another blood test; and then you have to pledge that "I will not" -- "I will be on birth control and I will not be pregnant while I take this drug." And then, and then every time you want to get it refilled, you have to call in and pledge orally

1 THE COURT: Right. MR. BALL: So that should be e-mailed? 2 THE COURT: E-mail to Michelle. 3 4 MR. SMITH: That really was the last thing, Your 5 Honor. That is. 6 MR. BALL: THE COURT: All right, Stacie, recess this puppy. 7 THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess. 8 9 (Court adjourned at 3:55 p.m.) 10 11 12 13 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I, Christine Dohack LaBuwi, RMR, CRR, Official 14 15 Court Reporter for the U.S. District Court, Southern District of Illinois, do hereby certify that I reported 16 with mechanical stenography the proceedings contained in 17 18 pages 1-154; and that the same is a full, true, correct and complete transcript from the record of proceedings in 19 the above-entitled matter. 20 21 22 DATED this 16th day of November, 2017 23 s/Christine Dohack LaBuwi, RMR, CRR 24 25 Christine Dohack LaBuwi, RMR, CRR